| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/256,845 | 02/24/1999 | THEORDORE ALLEN HUCK | SF/0024.00 | 1360 |

27815    7590    10/24/2002

DARRYL A. SMITH
1700 GREEN HILLS RD.
SCOTTS VALLEY, CA   95066

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| ROMERO, ALMARI C |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2176 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/256,845 | | HUCK, THEORDORE ALLEN |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit |
| | Almari Romero | | 2176 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05 August 2002_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.      2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-45_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-45_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

### Response to Amendment

1.      This action is responsive to communications: Request for Reconsideration filed on 8/5/02.

2.      Claims 1-45 are pending in the case.

### Response to Arguments

3.      Applicant's arguments filed on 8/5/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A.      Regarding applicant's remarks on page 2, 4th paragraph – page 3, 1st paragraph:

Krishna does disclose and suggest invoking of run-time handlers or services. Krishna discloses invoking run-time handlers (on col. 3, lines 21-23 and col. 6, lines 44-52: teaches running templates on demand or at scheduled intervals by the Page Builder). Krishna discloses invoking run-time services (on col. 5, lines 31-46 and col. 6, lines 44-52: teaches actions are invoked when running a template file).

B.      Regarding applicant's remarks on page 3, 2nd paragraph:

Krishna discloses invoking specific functionality for the particular client (on col. 2, line 62 – col. 3, line 9: teaches objects and actions on a web page are to be invoked by a response from a user input or click). Krishna discloses determining particular run-time services to be invoked for a given client (on col. 3, lines 6-9 and col. 5, lines 31-46: teaches actions to be taken (services) are invoked in response to user inputs or triggers (given client)).

C.      Regarding applicant's remarks on page 3, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:

Krishna discloses the dictionary to determine which specific functionality should be

invoked (providing instructions for obtaining and formatting objects which will invoke a set of

actions when object is displayed for viewing; col. 1, lines 21-32 and col. 2, lines 1-8).

Therefore, the claims stand rejected as follows:

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.      **Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishna**

**et al. (USPN 6,055,522 – filed on 6/1997 in view of Kiyono et al. (USPN 6,137,483 – filed**

**11/1996).**

**Regarding independent claim 26**, Krishna et al. (Krishna) discloses:

A system for executing an application; the system comprising:

at least one client computer running browser software (the client computer 130 has a

browser program 132; col.4, lines 41-52);

a template repository for storing templates (the template file 112 is stored; col.5, lines 1-

12), each template including tokens specifying particular run-time services to be invoked for a

given client operating on a given platform (use URLs contained within the template file 1 12 to

obtain the content and action information from servers 102 and/or 122; col.5, lines 16-30 and

objects and actions on a web page are to be invoked by a response from a user input or click; col. 2, line 62 – col. 3, line 9); and

a back-end database providing client access to information, in response to client invocation of run-time services (the server 102 then downloads the template file 112 to the browser 132... the Viewer program 114 is also downloaded to the client computer 130; col.5, lines 16-46 and col. 6, lines 44-52 and actions are invoked when running a template file; col. 5, lines 31-46 and col. 6, lines 44-52).

determining particular run-time services to be invoked for a given client (actions to be taken (services) are invoked in response to user inputs or triggers (given client); col. 3, lines 6-9 and col. 5, lines 31-46).

However, Krishna does not explicitly disclose, "a template manager, responsive to requests from a client computer, for parsing at least one template".

Kiyono et al. (Kiyono) discloses a template manager, responsive to requests from a client computer, for parsing at least one template (the template manager manages a template describing therein a logic structure, a layout structure, and a physical operation common to a diversity of multimedia content; col. 4, lines 38-41; col.6, lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have provided the capability for handling both regularity and diversification of multimedia documents.

**Regarding dependent claim 27**, Krishna discloses:

at least one client computer comprises a personal computer connected to a network (the server computer 102 communicates with other computers over a network; col.4, lines 34-39).

**Regarding dependent claim 28**, Krishna discloses:

the network includes connectivity to the Internet (communicates with other computers

over a network such as the Internet 120; col.4, lines 34-39).

**Regarding dependent claim 29**, Krishna discloses:

the browser software includes Internet browser software for viewing Hypertext Markup

Language documents (display the Web page; col.5, lines 16-30).

**Regarding dependent claim 30**, Krishna discloses:

at least some of the templates comprise at least page description language template (the

template file consists of a specification for a Web page in terms of object content and actions to

be taken on or between such objects; col.2, lines 62-65).

**Regarding dependent claim 31**, Krishna discloses:

at least one page description language template comprises a Hypertext Markup Language

document (Hypertext Markup Language pages; col.3, lines 9-17).

**Regarding dependent claim 32**, Krishna discloses:

It would have been obvious that a Standard Generalized Markup Language document is

used widely to manage large documents that are subject to frequent revisions and need to be

printed in different formats.

**Regarding dependent claim 33**, Krishna discloses:

the tokens are embedded in the at least one template using user-defined tags (HTML file

tag sets; col.7, lines 20-25).

**Regarding dependent claim 34**, Krishna discloses:

run-time services that are actually invoked is determined based, at least in part, on which

platform a given client executes (the client computer... running within the Windows 95 operating

system; col.4, lines 41-52).

**Regarding dependent claim 35**, Krishna discloses:

each token may be resolved into a request for a specific run-time service (client 130 first

makes a request ...downloaded to the client computer 130; col.5, lines 162-28).

**Regarding dependent claim 36**, Kiyono discloses:

the template manager stores parsed templates in a template cache, so that each template

need only be parsed once (the template operating means extracts a template stored ...combines

the extracted template; col.7, lines 37-56).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided Krishna's system with the enhanced capability of improving performance.

**Regarding dependent claim 37**, Kiyono discloses:

the parsed templates are maintained on a persistent storage, so that the parsed templates

are available from one application execution session to another (a template stored in the template

managing means; col.5, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided Krishna's system with the enhanced capability of improving performance.

**Regarding dependent claim 38**, Kiyono discloses:

any parsed templates are occasionally flushed, so that the system is forced to again parse

the at least one template (the restrictive condition checking means 27 checks ...condition

described in the template; col.6, lines 48-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for handling templates.

**Regarding dependent claim 39**, Krishna discloses:

the run-time services of the system include providing access to information from the

back-end database (obtain the content and action information from servers; col.5, lines 25-30).

**Regarding dependent claim 40**, Kiyono discloses:

the back-end database comprises an SQL database system that retrieves information in

response to SQL queries (a set of items is handled as a logic structure and an operation for

searching an item; col.3, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for searching an item satisfying a search condition.

**Regarding dependent claim 41**, Krishna discloses:

at least one template comprises at least one read-only template (a downloadabie Viewer

file 114; col.5, lines 13-15).

**Regarding dependent claim 42**, Krishna discloses:

at least one template is loaded by browser software running at the particular client (if the

template file 112... may be viewed by a browser; col.6, lines 7-11).

**Regarding dependent claim 43**, Krishna discloses:

at least one template comprises an input form having a platform-specific presentation

when rendered at a given client (the template file also includes a set of actions to be taken on or

between the objects in response to user inputs; col.3, lines 6-9).

**Regarding dependent claim 44**, Krishna discloses:

the requests include opening a communication socket at a given client (the client 130 first

makes a request to the server 102; col.5, lines 16-20).

**Regarding dependent claim 45**, Krishna discloses:

run-time services are invoked is determined based, at least in part, on a specific client

session that is executing (a template file 112 specifies... specified by URLs...located content

files; col.5, lines 47-57).

**Regarding independent claim 1**, Krishna discloses:

A method for creating and deploying an application in a computing system, the method

comprising:

creating a least one template (template files 112; col. 4, lines 30-32 having references to

specific functionality that is to be invoked at a given client (the content may actually be

imbedded in the template file or may simply be a reference to where the content can be found,

such as via a Universal Resource Locator; col. 3, lines 1-17);

executing the application at a particular client (the client computer... running within the

Windows 95; col. 5, lines 40-52) including substeps of:

receiving a run-time request from the particular client to load the at least one

template (client 130 first makes a request...then downloads the template file 112 to the browser

132; col. 5, lines 16-31);

determining from the dictionary (providing instructions for obtaining and

formatting objects; col. 1, lines 21-32 and col. 2, lines 1-8) and from the references of the at least

one template any specific functionality that is to be invoked for the particular client (the template

file consists of a specification for a Web page in terms of object content and actions to be taken

on or between such objects; col. 2, lines 62-65); and

invoking specific functionality for the particular client by invoking corresponding

run-time handlers for the determined references (operations may be performed at the time a user

...requests access to the template 112 file ...at scheduled intervals; col. 3, lines 21-33, col. 5,

lines 25-50, and col. 6, lines 44-52 and running templates on demand or at scheduled intervals

by the Page Builder (run-time handler); col. 3, lines 21-23 and col. 6, lines 44-52).

However, Krishna does not explicitly disclose, "registering the references of the at least

one template".

Kiyono teaches registering the references of the at least one template (the logic structure

in the template is synthesized with the selected material information by the logic structure

synthesizing means; col.7, lines 37-56).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for creating a specific multimedia document.

**Regarding dependent claim 2**, Krishna discloses:

the at least one template comprises at least one page description language template (the

template file consists of a specification for a Web page in terms of object content and actions to

be taken on or between such objects; col.2, lines 62-65).

**Regarding dependent claim 3**, Krishna discloses:

at least page description language template comprises at least one Hypertext Markup

Language document (display the Web page; col.5, lines 16-30).

**Regarding dependent claim 4**, Krishna discloses:

It would have been obvious that a Standard Generalized Markup Language document is

used widely to manage large documents that are subject to frequent revisions and need to be

printed in different formats.

**Regarding dependent claim 5**, Krishna discloses:

the references are embedded in the at least one template using user-defined (HTML file

tag sets; col.7, lines 20-25).

**Regarding dependent claim 6**, Krishna discloses:

which specific functionality that is actually invoked is determined based, at least in part,

on which platform a given client executes (the client computer... running within the Windows 95

operating system; col.4, lines 41-52).

**Regarding dependent claim 7**, Kiyono discloses:

invoking a template manager for parsing the at least one template, for determining

references embedded in the at least one template (the template manager manages a template

describing therein a logic structure, a layout structure, and a physical operation common to a

diversity of multimedia content; Abstract, and col.4, lines 38-41 and col.6, lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for handling templates.

**Regarding dependent claim 8**, Kiyono discloses:

the references comprise tokens that are parsed by the template manager (the template

manager manages a template describing therein a logic . structure, a layout structure, and a

physical operation common to a diversity of multimedia content; Abstract, and col.4, lines 38-41

& col.6, lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for handling both regularity and diversification of multimedia documents.

**Regarding dependent claim 9**, Krishna discloses:

wherein each token may be resolved into a request for a specific run-time service (client

130 first makes a request... downloaded to the client computer 130; col.5, lines 16-28).

**Regarding dependent claim 10**, Kiyono discloses:

the template manager stores parsed templates in a template cache, so that each template

need only be parsed once (the template operating means extracts a template stored.. . combines

the extracted template; col.7, lines 37-56).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided Krishna's system with the enhanced capability of improving performance.

**Regarding dependent claim 11**, Kiyono discloses:

the parsed templates are maintained on a persistent storage, so that the parsed templates

are available from one application execution session to another (a template stored in the template

managing means; col.6, lines 48-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided Krishna's system with the enhanced capability of improving performance.

**Regarding dependent claim 12**, Kiyono discloses:

any parsed templates are flushed, so that the system is forced to again parse the at least

one template (the restrictive condition checking means 27 checks ...condition described in the

template; col.6, lines 48-65).

It would have been obvious to a. person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for handling templates.

**Regarding dependent claim 13**, Krishna discloses:

the run-time services of the system include providing access to information from a back-

end database (obtain the content and action information from servers; col.5, lines 25-30).

**Regarding dependent claim 14**, Kiyono discloses:

the back-end database comprises an SQL database system that retrieves information in

response to SQL queries (a set of items is handled as a logic structure and an operation for

searching an item; col.3, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for searching an item satisfying a search condition from the set of items.

**Regarding dependent claim 15**, Krishna discloses:

at least one template comprises at least one read-only template (a downloadable Viewer

file 114; col.5, lines 13-15).

**Regarding dependent claim 16**, Krishna discloses:

at least one template is loaded by browser software running at the particular client (if the

template file 112. . . may be viewed by a browser; col.6, lines 7-11).

**Regarding dependent claim 17**, Krishna discloses:

at least one template comprises an input form having a platform-specific presentation:

when rendered at a given client (the template file also includes a set of actions to be taken on or

between the objects in response to user inputs; col.3, lines 6-9).

**Regarding dependent claim 18**, Krishna discloses:

run-time request includes opening a communication socket at the particular client (the

client 130 first makes a request to the server 102; col.5, lines 16-20).

**Regarding dependent claim 19**, Krishna discloses:

wherein the specific functionality invoked is based, at least in part, on a specific client

session that is executing (a template file 112 specifies... specified by URLs...located content

files; col.5, lines 47-57).

**Regarding dependent claim 20**, Krishna discloses:

the application comprises a single code base application that is deployed on multiple

platforms (having content files 124 stored therein or client computers 130 and 140; col.4, lines

38-40).

**Regarding dependent claim 21**, Krishna discloses:

wherein new functionality is added to the application by modifying the at least one

template, so that the new functionality may be added without recompiling the application (the

template file 112 contains actions which allow the user to change the resulting state of the

display these include objects in the template file 112; col.6, lines 52-61).

**Regarding dependent claim 22**, Krishna discloses:

the references comprise tokens specifying programming constructs (a set of links is also

produced which specify how transitions between such representations should occur; col.2, lines

59-61).

**Regarding dependent claim 23**, Kiyono discloses:

the programming constructs include conditional logic statements (a logic structure and an

operation for searching; col.3, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for searching an item satisfying a search condition.

**Regarding dependent claim 24**, Kiyono discloses:

As to dependent claim 24, Kiyono teaches the conditional logic statements include "if"

statements (the operation of searching an item satisfying a searching condition; col.8, lines 30-

45).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for searching an item satisfying a search condition.

**Regarding dependent claim 25**, Kiyono discloses:

the conditional logic statements include "for" loops (the operation of searching an item

satisfying a searching condition; col.8, lines 31-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kiyono with Krishna because it would have

provided the capability for searching an item satisfying a search condition.

### *Conclusion*

6.     **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**  Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.  In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Romero whose telephone number is (703) 305-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (7:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

AR
October 17, 2002

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100